

On the asymptotic value of the choice number of complete multi-partite graphs

Nurit Gazit*, Michael Krivelevich[†]

February 1, 2008

*The School of Mathematical Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel.
e-mail: perfect@post.tau.ac.il.

[†]The School of Mathematical Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel.
e-mail: krivelev@post.tau.ac.il. Research supported in part by USA-Israel BSF Grant
2002-133, and by grant 64/01 from the Israel Science Foundation.

Abstract

We calculate the asymptotic value of the choice number of complete multi-partite graphs, given certain limitations on the relation between the sizes of the different sides. In the bipartite case, we prove that if $n_0 \leq n_1$ and $\log n_0 \gg \log \log n_1$, then $ch(K_{n_0, n_1}) = (1 + o(1)) \frac{\log_2 n_1}{\log_2 x_0}$, where x_0 is the unique root of the equation $x - 1 - x^{\frac{k-1}{k}} = 0$ in the interval $[1, \infty)$ and $k = \frac{\log_2 n_1}{\log_2 n_0}$. In the multipartite case, we prove that if $n_0 \leq n_1 \dots \leq n_s$, and n_0 is not too small compared to n_s , then $ch(K_{n_0, \dots, n_s}) = (1 + o(1)) \frac{\log_2 n_s}{\log_2 x_0}$. Here x_0 is the unique root of the equation $sx - 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} x^{\frac{k_j-1}{k_j}} = 0$ in the interval $[1, \infty)$, and for every $0 \leq i \leq s-1$, $k_i = \frac{\log_2 n_s}{\log_2 n_i}$.

Key words: choice number.

1 Introduction

The *choice number* $ch(G)$ of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is the minimum number k such that for every assignment of a list $S(v)$ of at least k colors to each vertex $v \in V$, there is a proper vertex coloring of G assigning to each vertex v a color from its list $S(v)$. The concept of choosability was introduced by Vizing in 1976 [2] and independently by Erdős, Rubin and Taylor in 1979 [1]. It is also shown in [1] that the choice number of the complete bipartite graph $K_{n,n}$ satisfies $ch(K_{n,n}) = (1 + o(1)) \log_2 n$. In this paper we calculate the asymptotic value of the choice number of a general complete bipartite graph K_{n_0, n_1} and then expand the result to the case of a complete multi-partite graph. We begin by proving (note that throughout this paper all logs are binary):

Theorem 1 *Let $2 \leq n_0 \leq n_1$ be integers, and let $n_0 = (\log n_1)^{\omega(1)}$. Denote $k = \frac{\log n_1}{\log n_0}$. Let x_0 be the unique root of the equation $x - 1 - x^{\frac{k-1}{k}} = 0$ in the interval $[1, \infty)$. Then $ch(K_{n_0, n_1}) = (1 + o(1)) \frac{\log n_1}{\log x_0}$.*

As usual, $\omega(1)$ stands for a function tending to infinity arbitrarily slowly as its variable tends to infinity.

We will prove the theorem in two parts, showing first the upper bound and then the lower bound. In the graph K_{n_0, n_1} we label the group of n_0 vertices by V_0 and the group of n_1 vertices by V_1 .

2 The Upper Bound

Theorem 2 *Let $2 \leq n_0 \leq n_1$ be integers. Denote $k = \frac{\log n_1}{\log n_0}$. Let x_0 be the unique root of the equation $x - 1 - x^{\frac{k-1}{k}} = 0$ in the interval $[1, \infty)$. Then $ch(K_{n_0, n_1}) \leq \lceil \frac{\log n_1}{\log x_0} \rceil + 1$.*

Proof.

Lemma 2.1 *If there exists a $p, 0 \leq p \leq 1$, s.t. $n_0 p^r + n_1 (1 - p)^r \leq 1$ then $ch(K_{n_0, n_1}) \leq r$.*

Proof. We show that given, for each vertex $v \in V(K_{n_0, n_1})$, a set of colors $S(v)$ of size r , there is a proper vertex coloring of the graph, assigning to each vertex v a color from $S(v)$.

We partition the set of all available colors $S = \bigcup_{v \in V} S(v)$ into two subsets S_1 and S_0 in the following manner: each color $c \in S$ is chosen randomly and independently with probability p to be in S_1 , and with probability $1 - p$ to be in S_0 . We will show that with positive probability the sets S_0 and S_1 chosen satisfy the condition: each vertex $v \in V_0$ has a color $c \in S(v)$ s.t. $c \in S_0$, and each vertex $v \in V_1$ has a color $c \in S(v)$ s.t. $c \in S_1$. Given such S_0 and S_1 , we can color each vertex in V_0 with a color from S_0 , and each vertex in V_1 with a color from S_1 , and since $S_0 \cap S_1 = \emptyset$, we get a proper coloring.

For each $v \in V_1$ the probability that a bad event occurs, i.e. that all the colors in $S(v)$ are chosen to be in S_0 , is $(1 - p)^r$. For each $v \in V_0$ the probability that a bad event occurs, i.e. that all the colors in $S(v)$ are chosen to be in S_1 , is p^r . Therefore the expectation of the number of bad events that occur is $n_0 p^r + n_1 (1 - p)^r \leq 1$. Since either $p > 0$ or $1 - p > 0$, we can assume w.l.o.g. that $1 - p > 0$. Then since, for example, the case in which all the colors in S are chosen to be in S_0 happens with probability $(1 - p)^{|S|} > 0$, and gives n_1 bad events, the case in which 0 events occur also happens with positive probability (otherwise the expectation would be greater than 1). Therefore we get the desirable partition. ■

Lemma 2.2 *Given r s.t. $(\frac{1}{n_0})^{\frac{1}{r-1}} + (\frac{1}{n_1})^{\frac{1}{r-1}} \geq 1$, let $p = \frac{(\frac{1}{n_0})^{\frac{1}{r-1}}}{(\frac{1}{n_0})^{\frac{1}{r-1}} + (\frac{1}{n_1})^{\frac{1}{r-1}}}$. Then $n_0 p^r + n_1 (1 - p)^r \leq 1$.*

Proof. If $p = \frac{(\frac{1}{n_0})^{\frac{1}{r-1}}}{(\frac{1}{n_0})^{\frac{1}{r-1}} + (\frac{1}{n_1})^{\frac{1}{r-1}}}$ then $(\frac{p}{1-p})^{r-1} = \frac{n_1}{n_0}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} n_0 p^r + n_1 (1-p)^r &= n_0 p^r + n_1 \left(\frac{n_0}{n_1}\right) p^{r-1} (1-p) = n_0 p^{r-1} \\ &= n_0 \left(\frac{(\frac{1}{n_0})^{\frac{1}{r-1}}}{(\frac{1}{n_0})^{\frac{1}{r-1}} + (\frac{1}{n_1})^{\frac{1}{r-1}}} \right)^{r-1} = \left(\frac{1}{(\frac{1}{n_0})^{\frac{1}{r-1}} + (\frac{1}{n_1})^{\frac{1}{r-1}}} \right)^{r-1} \\ &\leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

■

All that remains now is to choose $r = r(n_0, n_1)$ satisfying the condition of Lemma 2.2. Let $r = \lceil \frac{\log n_1}{\log x_0} \rceil + 1$. Then $r-1 \geq \frac{\log n_1}{\log x_0}$, and hence $x_0 \geq n_1^{\frac{1}{r-1}}$. Since the function $f_k(x) = x - 1 - x^{\frac{k-1}{k}}$, where $k \geq 1$, is a monotonely increasing function in the interval $[1, \infty)$, and since $f_k(x_0) = 0$, it follows that $n_1^{\frac{1}{r-1}} \leq 1 + n_1^{\frac{1}{r-1} \frac{k-1}{k}} = 1 + (\frac{n_1}{n_0})^{\frac{1}{r-1}}$ as required. ■

3 The Lower Bound

Theorem 3 *If $2 \leq n_0 \leq n_1$ are integers, and $n_0 = (\log n_1)^{\omega(1)}$, then $ch(K_{n_0, n_1}) \geq (1 - o(1)) \frac{\log n_1}{\log x_0}$, where x_0 is the unique root of the equation $x - 1 - x^{\frac{k-1}{k}} = 0$ in the interval $[1, \infty)$ and $k = \frac{\log n_1}{\log n_0}$.*

Proof.

A *cover* of a hypergraph H is a subset M of the vertices of the hypergraph such that every hyperedge of H contains at least one vertex of M . A minimum cover is a cover which has the least cardinality among all covers.

Let us generate the hypergraph H_0 created by the color lists of the vertices in V_0 , i.e. the hypergraph whose vertices are the colors $\bigcup_{v \in V_0} S(v)$, and whose edges are the lists $S(v)$ for each $v \in V_0$. In the same way, we generate the hypergraph H_1 created by the color lists of the vertices in V_1 .

For any r , if we wish to prove $ch(K_{n_0, n_1}) > r$, it is enough to show that there are parameters $t \geq r$ and $0 \leq l \leq t$ s.t. it is possible to choose for each

vertex in K_{n_0, n_1} a list of r colors from $\{1, 2, \dots, t\}$, and the lists chosen satisfy:

1. The minimum cover of the hypergraph H_0 created by the color lists of the vertices in V_0 (i.e. the minimum size of a set L of colors s.t. for every $v \in V_0$, $S(v)$ contains at least one of the colors in L) is of cardinality at least l .
2. The minimum cover of the hypergraph H_1 created by the color lists of the vertices in V_1 is of cardinality at least $t - l + 1$.

If these conditions are satisfied, then when these color lists are assigned to the vertices of K_{n_0, n_1} , the graph cannot be properly colored. This is because at least l colors are needed to color one side, and at least $t - l + 1$ to color the other. Since there are only t colors in all, at least one color will be chosen by both sides – i.e., at least two vertices on opposite sides must be given the same color, implying that a proper coloring is not possible. Therefore, the choice number of the graph is greater than r .

Lemma 3.1 *If there exist parameters t and l such that $t \geq r, 0 \leq l \leq t$ and*

$$2^t e^{-\binom{l}{r} n_1} + 2^t e^{-\binom{t-l}{r} n_0} \leq 1 \quad (1)$$

then $ch(K_{n_0, n_1}) > r$.

Proof. It is easy to see that at least l colors are required for a cover of the hypergraph H_0 created by the color lists of the vertices in V_0 if and only if for each subset C of size $t - l + 1$ of $\{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ there is at least one $v \in V_0$ for which $S(v) \subset C$. In the same way, the minimum cover of the hypergraph H_1 created by the color lists of the vertices in V_1 is at least $t - l + 1$ if and only if for each subset C of size l of $\{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ there is at least one $v \in V_1$ for which $S(v) \subset C$.

For each vertex v in K_{n_0, n_1} , let $S(v)$ be a random subset of cardinality r of $\{1, 2, \dots, t\}$, chosen uniformly and independently among all $\binom{t}{r}$ subsets of

cardinality r of $\{1, 2, \dots, t\}$. We wish to find an r that guarantees that with positive probability:

1. For every subset C of size $t-l+1$ there is a vertex $v \in V_0$ s.t. $S(v) \subset C$,
and
2. For every subset C of size l there is a vertex $v \in V_1$ s.t. $S(v) \subset C$.

To simplify the calculations, we will change Condition 1 above to the stronger condition that:

1. For every subset C of size $t-l$ there is a vertex $v \in V_0$ s.t. $S(v) \subset C$.

For each fixed subset C of cardinality l of $\{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ and each $v \in V_1$, the probability that $S(v) \not\subset C$ is $1 - \frac{l \dots (l-r+1)}{t \dots (t-r+1)} = 1 - \frac{(l)_r}{(t)_r}$. Since there are n_1 vertices in V_1 and $\binom{t}{l}$ subsets of cardinality l of $\{1, \dots, t\}$, and since the color groups of the vertices were chosen independently, the probability that there is a subset C of size l that does not contain $S(v)$ for any $v \in V_1$ is at most $\binom{t}{l} \left(1 - \frac{(l)_r}{(t)_r}\right)^{n_1} < 2^t e^{-\frac{(l)_r}{(t)_r} n_1}$. In a similar fashion, the probability that there is a subset C of size $t-l$ that does not contain $S(v)$ for any $v \in V_0$ is at most $\binom{t}{t-l} \left(1 - \frac{(t-l)_r}{(t)_r}\right)^{n_0} < 2^t e^{-\frac{(t-l)_r}{(t)_r} n_0}$.

We are looking for an r that guarantees that the probability that at least one of Conditions 1 and 2 does not hold is smaller than 1. Therefore it is enough to show the sum of these probabilities is smaller than 1, i.e., it is enough to show: $2^t e^{-\frac{(l)_r}{(t)_r} n_1} + 2^t e^{-\frac{(t-l)_r}{(t)_r} n_0} \leq 1$. ■

Before proceeding to find t and l required in Lemma 3.1, we derive bounds on x_0 that will be useful at later stages of the proof.

Lemma 3.2 $2 \leq x_0(k) < \max(k, e+2)$

Proof. We begin by showing that if $k > e+1$, then $x_0(k) < k$. Since $f_k(x) = x-1-x^{\frac{k-1}{k}}$ is monotonely increasing, we need to show that $f_k(k) > 0$, or $k - k^{\frac{k-1}{k}} - 1 > 0$, or $(k-1)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} > k^{\frac{1}{k}}$. But the function $h(x) = x^{\frac{1}{x}}$ is

monotonely decreasing for $x > e$. So if $k > e+1$ then $k-1 > e$ and therefore $(k-1)^{\frac{1}{k-1}} > k^{\frac{1}{k}}$.

It can easily be seen that x_0 increases monotonely as a function of k (i.e. if $k_2 \geq k_1$, $x_0(k_2) \geq x_0(k_1)$). Therefore if $k \leq e+2$, then $x_0(k) \leq x_0(e+2) < e+2$.

To prove the lower bound on x_0 , observe that $f_k(2) = 2 - 1 - 2^{\frac{k-1}{k}} = 1 - 2^{\frac{k-1}{k}} \leq 0$ for every $k \geq 1$. ■

Lemma 3.3 *Let $n_0 = (\log n_1)^{\omega(1)}$. Define $r_0 = \frac{\log n_1}{\log x_0}$, $u = \frac{4 \log \log n_1}{\log n_0} r_0$ and $r = r_0 - u$. Then $r = (1 - o(1))r_0$, and for $t = (\frac{n_1}{n_0})^{\frac{1}{r}} r^2$ and $l = t \frac{1}{(\frac{n_1}{n_0})^{\frac{1}{r}} + 1}$, $2^t e^{-\frac{(l)r}{(t)r} n_1} + 2^t e^{-\frac{(t-l)r}{(t)r} n_0} \leq 1$.*

Proof. If $n_0 = (\log n_1)^{\omega(1)}$ then $\log \log n_1 \ll \log n_0$, and therefore $u = o(r_0)$, and $r = (1 - o(1))r_0$, as required. From the fact that $r = (1 - o(1))r_0$, it also follows that $r = \omega(1)$. This is because $x_0 < \max(k, e+2)$, and therefore, if $k \leq e+2$ then $r_0 = \frac{\log n_1}{\log x_0} > \frac{\log n_1}{\log(e+2)} = \omega(1)$, and otherwise $r_0 = \frac{\log n_1}{\log x_0} > \frac{\log n_1}{\log k} = \frac{\log n_1}{\log \frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_0}} = \frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_1 - \log \log n_0} \geq \frac{\log n_1}{\log \log n_1} = \omega(1)$. Hence $r = (1 - o(1))r_0 = \omega(1)$.

Let us denote $l_0 = l$ and $l_1 = t - l$. Then $t - l_i = t \frac{(\frac{n_1}{n_i})^{\frac{1}{r}}}{(\frac{n_1}{n_0})^{\frac{1}{r}} + 1}$, and $2^t e^{-\frac{(l)r}{(t)r} n_1} + 2^t e^{-\frac{(t-l)r}{(t)r} n_0} = \sum_{i=0}^1 2^t e^{-\frac{(t-l_i)r}{(t)r} n_i}$. In order for this sum to be not greater than 1, it is enough to show that $\frac{(t-l_i)r}{(t)r} n_i \gg t$ for $i = 0, 1$. We begin by estimating $\frac{(t-l_i)r}{(t)r} n_i$.

Claim 3.4 $\frac{(t-l_i)r}{(t)r} n_i > \frac{1}{2e^2} \frac{n_1}{\left(\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} + 1\right)^r}$ for $i = 0, 1$.

Proof. $\frac{(t-l_i)r}{(t)r} > \left(\frac{t-l_i-r}{t-r}\right)^r = \left(\frac{t-l_i}{t}\right)^r \left(\frac{t(t-l_i-r)}{(t-l_i)(t-r)}\right)^r = \left(\frac{t-l_i}{t}\right)^r \left(1 - \frac{l_i r}{(t-l_i)(t-r)}\right)^r > \left(\frac{t-l_i}{t}\right)^r \left(1 - \frac{2l_i r}{(t-l_i)t}\right)^r$, where the last inequality is a result of $r < \frac{t}{2}$.

Now since $\frac{l_0 r}{(t-l_0)t} = \frac{l r}{(t-l)t} = \frac{t \frac{1}{\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} + 1} r}{t^2 \frac{\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}}{\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} + 1}} = \frac{r}{t \left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}} \leq \frac{r \left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}}{t} = \frac{1}{r} = o(1)$, and

$\frac{l_1 r}{(t-l_1)t} = \frac{(t-l)r}{lt} = \frac{r \left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}}{t} = \frac{1}{r} = o(1)$ we get (recalling that $1 - x \geq e^{-x}/2$)

for $0 \leq x \leq 1/2$ $\frac{(t-l_i)_r}{(t)_r} > \left(\frac{t-l_i}{t}\right)^r \frac{1}{2e^2}$. Therefore $\frac{(t-l_i)_r}{(t)_r} n_i > \left(\frac{t-l_i}{t}\right)^r n_i \frac{1}{2e^2} = \left(\frac{\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}}{\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}+1}\right)^r n_i \frac{1}{2e^2} = \frac{1}{2e^2} \frac{n_1}{\left(\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}+1\right)^r}$. ■

Hence in order to prove that (1) holds it is now enough to prove that

$$\frac{n_1}{\left(\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}+1\right)^r} \gg t.$$

Claim 3.5 $\frac{n_1}{\left(\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}+1\right)^r} \gg t$.

Proof. $\frac{n_1}{\left(\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}+1\right)^r} = \left(\frac{n_1^{\frac{1}{r}}}{\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}+1}\right)^r = \left[\frac{n_1^{\frac{1}{r_0}}}{\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_0}}+1} \frac{n_1^{\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{r_0}}}{\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}+1} \left(\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_0}}+1\right)\right]^r$.

Since $\frac{n_1^{\frac{1}{r_0}}}{\left(\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_0}}+1\right)} = \frac{n_1^{\frac{\log x_0}{\log n_1}}}{\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{\log x_0}{\log n_1}}+1} = \frac{x_0}{\frac{x_0}{\log n_0}+1} = \frac{x_0}{x_0^{\frac{k-1}{k}}+1} = 1$, we get

$$\frac{n_1}{\left(\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}+1\right)^r} = \left(n_1^{\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{r_0}} \frac{\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_0}}+1}{\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}+1}\right)^r > \left(n_1^{\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{r_0}} \frac{\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_0}}}{\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}}\right)^r, \text{ where the last in-}$$

equality follows from $r < r_0$. So $\frac{n_1}{\left(\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}+1\right)^r} > \left(n_1^{\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{r_0}} \frac{\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_0}}}{\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}}\right)^r = n_0^{\left(\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{r_0}\right)r} =$

$$n_0^{1-\frac{r}{r_0}} = n_0^{\frac{u}{r_0}} = n_0^{\frac{4 \log \log n_1}{\log n_0}} = \log^4 n_1.$$

Let us now estimate $t = \left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} r^2$. Observe that $r^2 < r_0^2 = \left(\frac{\log n_1}{\log x_0}\right)^2 \leq \log^2 n_1$. Also,

$$\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} = 2^{\frac{\log n_1 - \log n_0}{r}} = 2^{\frac{\log n_1 - \log n_0}{\left(1 - \frac{4 \log \log n_1}{\log n_0}\right) \log x_0}} = x_0^{\frac{\frac{\log n_1 - \log n_0}{\log n_1}}{1 - \frac{4 \log \log n_1}{\log n_0}}} \leq x_0^{1+o(1)},$$

where the last inequality stems from the assumption that $n_0 = (\log n_1)^{\omega(1)}$. Since $x_0 = O(k)$, $\left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq x_0^{1+o(1)} = (O(k))^{1+o(1)} = O((\log n_1)^{1+o(1)})$. Therefore $t = \left(\frac{n_1}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} r^2 = O((\log n_1)^{3+o(1)}) \ll \log^4 n_1$. ■

This also ends the proof of Lemma 3.3, and therefore of the lower bound and of Theorem 1.

4 Generalization - Multi-Partite Graphs

We wish to estimate the choice number of a general $(s + 1)$ -partite graph $K_{n_0, n_1, \dots, n_s}$. In the graph $K_{n_0, n_1, \dots, n_s}$ we label the group of n_i vertices by V_i , for each $0 \leq i \leq s$. Using a proof similar to that of the bipartite case, we will prove:

Theorem 4 *Let $s \geq 1$ be a fixed integer. Let $2 \leq n_0 \leq n_1 \dots \leq n_s$, and assume that $n_0 = (\log n_s)^\alpha$, where $\alpha \geq 2\sqrt{\frac{\log n_s}{\log \log n_s}}$. For every $0 \leq i \leq s - 1$ denote $k_i = \frac{\log n_s}{\log n_i}$. Let x_0 be the unique root of the equation $sx - 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} x^{\frac{k_j-1}{k_j}} = 0$ in the interval $[1, \infty)$. Then $ch(K_{n_0, \dots, n_s}) = (1 + o(1))^{\frac{\log n_s}{\log x_0}}$.*

Again we divide the proof into two parts – the upper bound and the lower bound.

5 The Upper Bound for Multi-Partite Graphs

Theorem 5 *Let $2 \leq n_0 \leq \dots \leq n_s$ be integers, and let $0 < \epsilon < 1$ be a constant. For every $0 \leq i \leq s - 1$ denote $k_i = \frac{\log n_s}{\log n_i}$. Let x_0 be the unique root of the equation $(s + \epsilon) \cdot x - 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} x^{\frac{k_j-1}{k_j}} = 0$ in the interval $[1, \infty)$. Define $r = \lceil \frac{\log n_s}{\log x_0} \rceil + 1$. Then $ch(K_{n_0, \dots, n_s}) \leq r$, for n_s large enough.*

Proof.

Lemma 5.1 *If there exist $p_0, \dots, p_s$ such that $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$ for every $0 \leq i \leq s$, $\sum_{i=0}^s p_i = 1$ and $\sum_{i=0}^s n_i (1 - p_i)^r \leq 1$, then $ch(K_{n_0, n_1, \dots, n_s}) \leq r$.*

Proof. The proof is identical to that of the bipartite case (Lemma 2.1), only this time we partition the set of all available colors into $s + 1$ sets, using the probabilities p_i . A bad event for a vertex $v \in V_i$ is one in which all the colors in $S(v)$ are chosen to be in color groups other than S_i , and it happens with probability $(1 - p_i)^r$. ■

Lemma 5.2 Given r s.t. $\sum_{i=0}^s n_i^{-\frac{1}{r-1}} \geq s^{\frac{r}{r-1}}$, let $p_i = 1 - \frac{sn_i^{-\frac{1}{r-1}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s n_j^{-\frac{1}{r-1}}}$ for $0 \leq i \leq s$. Then $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$ for each $0 \leq i \leq s$, $\sum_{i=0}^s p_i = 1$, and $\sum_{i=0}^s n_i(1-p_i)^r \leq 1$.

Proof. In order for p_i to be non-negative, we must demand that for every $0 \leq i \leq s$, $\frac{sn_i^{-\frac{1}{r-1}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s n_j^{-\frac{1}{r-1}}} \leq 1$, or $s \leq \sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_i}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r-1}}$. But if $s^{\frac{r}{r-1}} \leq \sum_{j=0}^s n_j^{-\frac{1}{r-1}}$, then for every $0 \leq i \leq s$, $s < s^{\frac{r}{r-1}} \leq \sum_{j=0}^s n_j^{-\frac{1}{r-1}} \leq \sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_i}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r-1}}$. Also,

$$\sum_{i=0}^s p_i = s + 1 - \sum_{i=0}^s (1 - p_i) = s + 1 - \sum_{i=0}^s \frac{s(n_i^{-\frac{1}{r-1}})}{\sum_{j=0}^s n_j^{-\frac{1}{r-1}}} = s + 1 - s = 1.$$

If $1 - p_i = \frac{sn_i^{-\frac{1}{r-1}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s n_j^{-\frac{1}{r-1}}}$ then $\left(\frac{1-p_i}{1-p_j}\right)^{r-1} = \frac{n_j}{n_i}$. Therefore, for any i ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^s n_j(1-p_j)^r &= n_i(1-p_i)^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^s (1-p_j) = s \cdot n_i(1-p_i)^{r-1} \\ &= s \cdot n_i \left(\frac{sn_i^{-\frac{1}{r-1}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s n_j^{-\frac{1}{r-1}}} \right)^{r-1} = \left(\frac{s^{\frac{r}{r-1}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s n_j^{-\frac{1}{r-1}}} \right)^{r-1} \\ &\leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

■

Let $r = \lceil \frac{\log n_s}{\log x_0} \rceil + 1$. Then $r - 1 \geq \frac{\log n_s}{\log x_0}$, and thus $x_0 \geq n_s^{\frac{1}{r-1}}$.

Since the function $g_{k_0, \dots, k_{s-1}, \epsilon}(x) = (s + \epsilon) \cdot x - 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} x^{\frac{k_j-1}{k_j}}$, where $k_j \geq 1$ for each j , is a monotonely increasing function in the interval $[1, \infty)$, and since $g_{k_0, \dots, k_{s-1}, \epsilon}(x_0) = 0$, it follows that for r large enough, or for n_s large enough (see Lemma 6.2 below, and the beginning of the proof of Lemma 3.3), $s^{\frac{r}{r-1}} n_s^{\frac{1}{r-1}} \leq (s + \epsilon) n_s^{\frac{1}{r-1}} \leq 1 + \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} n_s^{\frac{1}{r-1} \frac{k_j-1}{k_j}} = 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} \left(\frac{n_s}{n_i}\right)^{\frac{1}{r-1}}$ as required.

■

6 The Lower Bound for Multi-Partite Graphs

Theorem 6 *Let $2 \leq n_0 \dots \leq n_s$ be integers, and let $n_0 = (\log n_s)^\alpha$, where $\alpha \geq 2\sqrt{\frac{\log n_s}{\log \log n_s}}$. For every $0 \leq i \leq s-1$ denote $k_i = \frac{\log n_s}{\log n_i}$. Let x_0 be the unique root of the equation $s \cdot x - 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} x^{\frac{k_j-1}{k_j}} = 0$ in the interval $[1, \infty)$. Then $ch(K_{n_0, \dots, n_s}) \geq (1 - o(1)) \frac{\log n_s}{\log x_0}$.*

Proof. Similarly to the bipartite case, in order to prove $ch(K_{n_0, \dots, n_s}) > r$, it is enough to show that there are a $t \geq r$ and a sequence of $0 \leq l_i \leq t$ for which $\sum_{i=0}^s l_i = t$, s.t. it is possible to choose for each vertex in $K_{n_0, \dots, n_s}$ a list of r of colors from $\{1, 2, \dots, t\}$, and the lists chosen satisfy the following conditions: For each $0 \leq i \leq s-1$ the minimum cover of the hypergraph created by the color lists of the vertices in V_i is of cardinality at least l_i , and the additional condition: the minimum cover of the hypergraph created by the color lists of the vertices in V_s is of cardinality at least $l_s + 1$.

As in the bipartite case, if these conditions are satisfied, then by the pigeonhole principle at least 2 vertices in different groups must be given the same color, so the choice number is greater than r .

Lemma 6.1 *If there exist a parameter $t \geq r$ and a sequence of $0 \leq l_i \leq t$ for which $\sum_{i=0}^s l_i = t$ and*

$$\sum_{i=0}^s 2^t e^{-\frac{(t-l_i)r}{(t)_r} n_i} \leq 1 \quad (2)$$

then $ch(K_{n_0, \dots, n_s}) > r$.

Proof. Similar to the bipartite case. ■

As in the bipartite case, we calculate bounds on x_0 that will help us later on.

Lemma 6.2 $\frac{s+1}{s} \leq x_0 < \max(k_0, e+2)$

Proof. Since for every $0 \leq i \leq s$, $n_0 \leq n_i$, it follows that $k_0 = \frac{\log n_s}{\log n_0} \geq \frac{\log n_s}{\log n_i} = k_i$. Therefore, for a given x in the range $[1, \infty)$, $x^{\frac{k_0-1}{k_0}} \geq x^{\frac{k_i-1}{k_i}}$ for all i , and $f_{k_0, \dots, k_{s-1}}(x) = sx - 1 - \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} x^{\frac{k_i-1}{k_i}} \geq sx - 1 - sx^{\frac{k_0-1}{k_0}} = s(x - x^{\frac{k_0-1}{k_0}}) - 1 \geq x - x^{\frac{k_0-1}{k_0}} - 1$ (note all these functions increase monotonely as functions of x). Therefore the root x_0 in the range $[1, \infty)$ of the first equation $sx - 1 - \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} x^{\frac{k_i-1}{k_i}} = 0$, which is our equation, is not greater than the root x_1 of the equation $x - x^{\frac{k_0-1}{k_0}} - 1 = 0$.

But the last equation is $f_{k_0}(x) = 0$, and we already know from the bipartite case that its root is smaller than $\max(k_0, e + 2)$.

To prove the lower bound observe that $f_{k_0, \dots, k_{s-1}}(\frac{s+1}{s}) = s + 1 - 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} (\frac{s+1}{s})^{\frac{k_j-1}{k_j}} \leq s - s = 0$, and thus by monotonicity $x_0 \geq \frac{s+1}{s}$. ■

Lemma 6.3 Let $n_0 = (\log n_s)^\alpha$, where $\alpha \geq 2\sqrt{\frac{\log n_s}{\log \log n_s}}$. Define $r_0 = \frac{\log n_s}{\log x_0}$, $u = \frac{4 \log \log n_s}{\log n_0} r_0$ and $r = r_0 - u$. Then $r = (1 - o(1))r_0$, and for $t = (\frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{n_s}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}} - 1)r^2$ and $t - l_i = t \frac{s(\frac{n_s}{n_i})^{\frac{1}{r}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{n_s}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}}}$, one has: $0 \leq l_i \leq t$, $\sum_{i=0}^s l_i = t$, and $\sum_{i=0}^s 2^t e^{-\frac{(t-l_i)r}{t}} n_i \leq 1$, i.e., the assumptions of Lemma 6.1 are satisfied.

Proof. Since $n_0 = (\log n_s)^{\omega(1)}$, it follows that $r = (1 - o(1))r_0$, as in the bipartite case. Also, again as in the bipartite case, from $x_0 < \max(k_0, e + 2)$ it follows that $r_0 = \omega(1)$, and therefore $r = \omega(1)$.

We need to show that for every i , $0 \leq l_i \leq t$, or $0 \leq t - l_i \leq t$. Since $t - l_i$ is obviously non-negative, we need to prove that $t - l_i \leq t$, or $\frac{s(\frac{n_s}{n_i})^{\frac{1}{r}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{n_s}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}}} \leq 1$, or $s \leq \sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{n_i}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}}$. Since $n_0 \leq n_i$ for every i , it is enough to show $s \leq \sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{n_0}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}}$.

Since $r_0 = \frac{\log n_s}{\log x_0}$, we have: $x_0 = n_s^{\frac{1}{r_0}}$, and so $sn_s^{\frac{1}{r_0}} = 1 + \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} n_s^{\frac{1}{r_0} \frac{k_j-1}{k_j}} = \sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{n_s}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r_0}}$, or $s = \sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{1}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r_0}}$. But

$$\sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_0}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} = \sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{1}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_0}} \frac{n_0^{\frac{1}{r}}}{n_j^{\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r_0}}} \geq \frac{n_0^{\frac{1}{r}}}{n_s^{\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r_0}}} \sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{1}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_0}} = s \frac{n_0^{\frac{1}{r}}}{n_s^{\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r_0}}},$$

so it is enough to show $\frac{n_0^{\frac{1}{r}}}{\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{r_0}} \geq 1$. But $\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r_0} = \frac{1}{r} \frac{u}{r_0}$, so $\frac{1}{\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{r_0}} = 2^{-\frac{1}{r} \log n_s \frac{u}{r_0}} = 2^{-\frac{1}{r} \log n_s \frac{4 \log \log n_s}{\log n_0}} = 2^{-\frac{1}{r} \log n_s \frac{4}{\alpha}}$. Also $n_0^{\frac{1}{r}} = (\log n_s)^{\alpha \frac{1}{r}} = 2^{\frac{1}{r} \alpha \log \log n_s}$. Therefore

$$\frac{n_0^{\frac{1}{r}}}{\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{r_0}} = \left(2^{\alpha \log \log n_s - \log n_s \frac{4}{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \geq 1,$$

where the last inequality stems from the condition on α . Also,

$$\sum_{i=0}^s l_i = (s+1)t - \sum_{i=0}^s (t - l_i) = (s+1)t - \sum_{i=0}^s t \frac{s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_i}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}} = st + t - st = t.$$

All that is left for us to verify is that Condition (2) is fulfilled. The proof is, again, similar to the bipartite case.

Claim 6.4 $\frac{(t-l_i)_r}{(t)_r} n_i > \frac{s^r n_s}{\left(\sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}\right)^r} \frac{1}{2e^2}$ for $0 \leq i \leq s$.

Proof. We have: $\frac{(t-l_i)_r}{(t)_r} > \left(\frac{t-l_i-r}{t-r}\right)^r = \left(\frac{t-l_i}{t}\right)^r \left(1 - \frac{l_i r}{(t-l_i)(t-r)}\right)^r > \left(\frac{t-l_i}{t}\right)^r \left(1 - \frac{2l_i r}{(t-l_i)t}\right)^r$ where the last inequality is a result of $r < \frac{t}{2}$. By definition $t-l_i = t \frac{s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_i}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}}$,

$$\text{so } l_i = \frac{t \left(\sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} - s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_i}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}\right)}{\sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}}, \text{ and } \frac{l_i}{t-l_i} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} - s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_i}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}}{s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_i}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}} = \frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_i}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} - 1.$$

Now since $\frac{l_i r}{(t-l_i)t} = \left(\frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_i}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} - 1\right) \frac{r}{t} \leq \left(\frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} - 1\right) \frac{r}{t} = \frac{1}{r} = o(1)$, we get $\frac{(t-l_i)_r}{(t)_r} > \left(\frac{t-l_i}{t}\right)^r \frac{1}{2e^2}$.

$$\text{Hence } \frac{(t-l_i)_r}{(t)_r} n_i > \left(\frac{t-l_i}{t}\right)^r n_i \frac{1}{2e^2} = \left(\frac{s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_i}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}}\right)^r n_i \frac{1}{2e^2} = \frac{s^r n_s}{\left(\sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}\right)^r} \frac{1}{2e^2}.$$

■

Therefore in order to prove that (2) holds it is now enough to prove that

$$\frac{s^r n_s}{\left(\sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}\right)^r} \gg t \text{ (assuming } s \text{ is constant).}$$

Claim 6.5 $\frac{s^r n_s}{\left(\sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}\right)^r} \gg t$.

Proof. We have:

$$\frac{s^r n_s}{\left(\sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}\right)^r} = \left(\frac{s n_s^{\frac{1}{r}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}}\right)^r = \left[\frac{s n_s^{\frac{1}{r_0}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_0}}} \frac{n_s^{\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{r_0}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}} \sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_0}}\right]^r.$$

Since $\frac{sn_s^{\frac{1}{r_0}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{n_s}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r_0}}} = \frac{sn_s^{\frac{\log x_0}{\log n_s}}}{\sum_{j=0}^{s-1} (\frac{n_s}{n_j})^{\frac{\log x_0}{\log n_s} + 1}} = \frac{sx_0^{\frac{k_j-1}{k_j}}}{\sum_{j=0}^{s-1} x_0^{\frac{k_j-1}{k_j} + 1}} = 1$, we get $\frac{s^r n_s}{\left(\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{n_s}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}}\right)^r} = \left(n_s^{\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r_0}} \frac{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{n_s}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r_0}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{n_s}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}}}\right)^r = \left(\frac{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{1}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r_0}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{1}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}}}\right)^r$. Now,

$$\frac{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{1}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r_0}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{1}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}}} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{1}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}} (\frac{1}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r_0} - \frac{1}{r}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{1}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}}} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{1}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}} n_j^{\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r_0}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{1}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}}} \geq \frac{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{1}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}} n_0^{\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r_0}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{1}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}}},$$

where the last inequality is a result of $n_i \geq n_0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq s$ and of $r < r_0$.

So $\frac{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{1}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r_0}}}{\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{1}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}}} \geq n_0^{\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r_0}}$, and $\frac{s^r n_s}{\left(\sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{n_s}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}}\right)^r} \geq \left(n_0^{\frac{1}{r} - \frac{1}{r_0}}\right)^r = n_0^{1 - \frac{r}{r_0}} = n_0^{\frac{u}{r_0}} = n_0^{\frac{4 \log \log n_s}{\log n_0}} = \log^4 n_s$.

Let us now estimate $t = (\frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=0}^s (\frac{n_s}{n_j})^{\frac{1}{r}} - 1)r^2$. First, $r^2 < r_0^2 = (\frac{\log n_s}{\log x_0})^2 \leq (\frac{\log n_s}{\log \frac{s+1}{s}})^2 = C \log^2 n_s$ where $C = C(s)$ is a constant. Second,

$$\left(\frac{n_s}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} = 2^{\frac{\log n_s - \log n_0}{r}} = 2^{\frac{\log n_s - \log n_0}{(1 - \frac{4 \log \log n_s}{\log n_0}) \log x_0}} = x_0^{\frac{\frac{\log n_s - \log n_0}{\log n_s}}{1 - \frac{4 \log \log n_s}{\log n_0}}} \leq x_0^{1+o(1)},$$

where the last inequality stems from the assumption that $n_0 = (\log n_s)^{\omega(1)}$.

Since $x_0 = O(k_0)$, we get: $(\frac{n_s}{n_0})^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq x_0^{1+o(1)} = (O(k_0))^{1+o(1)} = O((\log n_s)^{1+o(1)})$.

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} t &= \left(\frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=0}^s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} - 1\right)r^2 = \left(\frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} - \frac{s-1}{s}\right)r^2 \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} \left(\frac{n_s}{n_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}\right)r^2 \leq \frac{1}{s} s \left(\frac{n_s}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} r^2 = \left(\frac{n_s}{n_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}} r^2 = O((\log n_s)^{3+o(1)}) \\ &\ll \log^4 n_s. \end{aligned}$$

■

This also ends the proof of Lemma 6.3, and therefore of the lower bound of the multi-partite case and of Theorem 4.

References

- [1] Erdős P., Rubin A. L. and Taylor H. (1979) Choosability in Graphs, *Proc. West Coast Conf. on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing, Congressus Numerantium XXVI*, 125-157.
- [2] Vizing V. G. (1976) Coloring the vertices of a graph in prescribed colors (in Russian), *Diskret. Analiz. No. 29, Metody Diskret. Anal. v. Teorii Kodov i Shem 101*, 3-10.